

REMARKS

Claims 17-19 and 24-26 remain pending. Claims 17 and 24 are currently amended, and claim 27 is canceled. No claims are added via the present submission.

Claims 17-19 and 24-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by *Dickenson et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,631,201). Regarding claim 27, the rejection is moot, because the claim is canceled. Regarding claims 17-19 and 24-26, applicants respectfully submit that that rejection should be withdrawn.

Independent claims 17 and 24, as now amended, both describe an identification-information-acquisition device such that

said identification-information-acquisition unit is configured to be detachable from the carrier unit in a state of being capable of receiving the identification information.

(Applicants provide support for this claim amendment in their specification, for example, in Fig. 12.) Each of claims 18, 19, 25, and 26 depend from one of claims 17 and 24, so they also describe this feature. *Dickenson et al.*, in contrast, does not teach this subject matter.

Applicants acknowledge that the following from *Dickenson et al.* is cited in the Office Action on page 3, bottom:

In an alternative embodiment of the interface card 1, the portion of the sensor module that comprises the sensor 5 may be detachable [sic] mounted to the sensor module 2. *When the interface card 1 is not in use, the user may detach the sensor 5 and store it*, for example, at a corner of the interface card 1 within the periphery of the interface card 1. In addition, *the sensor 5 may be easily replaced should the sensor 5 break or otherwise be damaged.* [Emphasis added.]

(Column 16, lines 25-32.) That is, although sensor 5 is configured to be detachable from sensor module 2, while sensor 5 is detached, it is not capable of receiving identification information. (Note the phrases “not it use” and “should the sensor 5 break or otherwise be damaged.”)

Unlike in *Dickenson et al.*, applicants’ identification-information-acquisition device is configured to be detachable from the carrier unit *and still remain capable of receiving the identification information*, and this feature is recited (explicitly or by dependency) in each pending claim. Thus, claims 17-19 and 24-27 distinguish applicants’ invention from *Dickenson et al.*

Accordingly, applicants solicit the withdrawal of the anticipation rejection.

In view of the remarks and amendments above, applicants submit that the entire application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a Notice of Allowability is hereby requested. If for any reason it is believed that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is welcome to contact applicants’ undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below to discuss resolution of the remaining issues.

If this paper is not timely filed, applicants petition for an extension of time. The fee for the extension, and any other fees that may be due, may be debited from Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP



Joseph L. Felber
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 48,109
Telephone: (202) 822-1100
Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

Enclosure: Petition for extension of time
JLF/ Q:\2000\000993A\000993A response to 11-29-04 action.doc